



Centers of Expertise

Presented By:

G. D. Perkins, Director
FH Radiation Protection



COE Purpose

- ▼ Establish Policies and Procedures
- ▼ Work Common Issues
- ▼ Communicate Lessons Learned
- ▼ Ensure Consistency of Implementation
- ▼ Establish Standards for Training
- ▼ Address Cost/Schedule Impacts



COE Membership

- ▼ Chairman - Director of the Functional Group
- ▼ Core Representatives - Represent Projects and Service Providers
- ▼ Voting Members Require Specific Training and Qualification
- ▼ All Welcome to Participate or Observe (e.g., RL, BHI, PNNL, RPP)



COE Process

▼ Structured Process

- Formal Meetings
- Issue Identification Process
- Decision Making Process
- Monitor Implementation Status and Report Results
- Retrievable Technical Basis System for All Decisions
- Hierarchy of Responsibilities (STA/FTA)



PIC Based Decision

2/7/01

Tracking Number

Problem Statement

Reason for Submittal
& Recommendation

Author & COE
Sponsor

Decision from COE

RAD CON CENTER OF EXPERTISE

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION FOR CONSIDERATION (PIC) FORM

TBTN: PBD-9910-PNP-0165, COE Transition

Brief Problem Statement:

The recent reorganization has affected the assignment of COE members. The specific problems revolve around designation of representatives to the COE and their delegation of authority. The only current method of approval for the COE is through the X+1 authority process.

Issue Description:

To be a voting member, representatives must be designated by the project or support provider in accordance with HNF-PRO-602, sections 2.2 and 2.3 (as interpreted by the Management Directive HNF-MD-5260). MSCs previously designated the existing membership.

Reasons for Submittal to COE for Consideration:

In order to re-establish a fully functional COE, the following actions should be considered:

1. The RP Director or Interpretive Authority should define in an interpretation the terms "qualified members" and "qualified designees" as used in HNF-PRO-602, section 2.12. (10/22/99)
2. RP Director should submit a request to each Project and Support Provider (as appropriate) requesting designation of COE representatives. (10/27/99)
3. Responsible Project and Support Providers should respond with COE representatives (11/12/99)
4. Upon receipt, the RP Director should evaluate and document approval of the designated COE representatives per HNF-PRO-603, section 1.1 (11/13/99)
5. Approved COE members should establish their delegation documentation. (11/18/99)
6. HNF-PRO-602 and 603 should be revised (12/18/99)

Prepared By: J. B. Stamper

Date: 10/19/1999

Sponsored By: E. J. Adams

PIC Disposition:

Problem Accepted ☐ Not Accepted ☐ by COE for CDMP Assignment

Assigned staff member

If Not Accepted, List Reasons:

PIC-Based Decision Rendered ☒ (Attach Record of Decision (ROD) form.)

COE Chair or Designee: Date: 10/21/99



Completed Decision Making Package

2/7/01

Title

References

Objective

RAD CON CENTER OF EXPERTISE COMPLETED DECISION MAKING PACKAGE (CDMP) COVER SHEET

Title: Soil and Outdoor Contamination Evaluation						
Site/Facility Applicability: Site				TBIN: CDMP-9903-CNC-0355		
Primary Rad Con						
Functional Area: Contamination Control				Superseded TBIN: N/A		
<p>Reference Documents:</p> <p>(1) DOE Order 5400.5, <i>Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment</i></p> <p>(2) HSRCM, <i>Hanford Site Radiological Control Manual</i></p> <p>(3) 10 CFR part 835 <i>Occupational Radiation Protection</i></p> <p>(4) CDMP-9607-PST-0053 <i>Posting and Control of Outdoor Areas for Radioactive Contamination in the Soil</i>, Rev. 0</p> <p>(5) CDGH-9609-MCC-0085 <i>Technical Basis for a Graded Approach for Controlling Outdoor Contamination</i>, Rev. 1</p> <p>(6) Draft Implementation Guide, DOE G-441.9-1 (December 1998) <i>Radioactive Contamination Control</i></p> <p>(7) Implementation Guide 10 CFR 835/G-1, Rev 1 (November, 1994), <i>Posting and Labeling for Radiological Control</i></p> <p>(8) HNF-EP-0063 <i>Hanford Site Solid Waste Acceptance Criteria</i>, Rev. 5, dated June 1998</p> <p>(9) CDGH-9607-RLS-0055, <i>Release Procedure Technical Basis</i>, 9/29/96, Rev. 0.01</p> <p>(10) DOE/RL-97-93, <i>Guidance for Radiological Release of DOE Real Property at Hanford</i>, Rev.0, dated May 1998.</p> <p>(11) NUREG-1575, <i>Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual (MARSSIM)</i>, December 1997.</p> <p>(12) NCRP Report 129, <i>Recommended Screening Limits for Contaminated Surface Soil and Review of Factors Relevant to Site-Specific Studies</i>, April 1999.</p>						
<p>Objective (Summary):</p> <p>Most of the major subcontractors have outdoor contamination area responsibilities. This Completed Decision Making Package is issued to describe management protocol for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • radiological surveillance of outdoor areas including Underground Radioactivity Areas, • outdoor contamination evaluation • Soil contamination-posting levels. 						
Revision Description:						
N/A						
Rev. No.	Originator	Date	Verified By	Date	Approved By	Date
0	P. A. Olsen	5/25/99	R. J. Ford			

ANALYSIS:

- Background
- Problem
- Objectives
- Requirements
- Criteria for Success
- Alternatives
- Results and Conclusions

CDMP

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Background •Problem •Objectives •Requirements •Criteria for Success •Alternatives •Results and Conclusions 	
	Page Numbers
	1
	3
	2
	4
	4
	4
	4
	4
	4
	8
	9
	11
	14
	14
	15
	15
	16
	17
4.4 CONTAMINATION FLOW DIAGRAM	25



Completed Decision Making Package

2/7/01

Results and Conclusions Based on Detailed Technical Analysis

2.7 Results and Conclusions

The results of this CDMP show that DOE sites are not consistent in their application of downposting levels. In order to DOE-RL develop volumetric CDMP recommends the use of dependent on the be downposted to URMA if six be developed for each area transfer of contamination in the entry without RWP, etc. Below al Control will be utilized. This od for evaluating outdoor

contamination is included in the attachment to this CDMP. The steps in the attached procedure will remain the same but responsibilities will be added in the actual procedure. Soil contamination areas will not be downposted until a release plan is developed.

3 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS AND SCHEDULE

Consolidate outdoor downposting requirements into one procedure using guidance from this CDMP, HNF-PRO-3232 and the HSRCM by July 29, 1999.

a. Procedure contains transferability measurements

Actions and Schedule are Tracked by COE

(3) 10 CFR part 835 *Occupational Radiation Protection*

(4) CDMP-9607-PST-0053 *Posting and Control of Outdoor Areas for Radioactive Contamination in the Soil*, Rev. 0

(5) CDGH-9609-MCC-0085 *Technical Basis for a Graded Approach for Controlling Outdoor Contamination*, Rev. 1

(6) Draft Implementation Guide, DOE G 441.9-1 (December 1998) *Radioactive Contamination Control*

(7) Implementation Guide 10 CFR 835/G-1, Rev 1 (November, 1994), *Posting and Labeling for Radiological Control*

(8) HNF-PRO-454 *Inactive Waste Sites*

(9) HNF-EP-0063 *Hanford Site Solid Waste Acceptance Criteria*, Rev. 5, dated June 1998

(10) CDGH-9607-RLS-0055, *Release Procedure Technical Basis*, 9/29/96, Rev. 0.01

(11) DOE/RL-97-93, *Guidance for Radiological Release of DOE Real Property at Hanford*, Rev.0, dated May 1998.



COE Benefits

- ▼ Fully Integrated, Safety Management Process
 - Recognized as a Hanford ISMS Noteworthy Practice
- ▼ Provides Project Representation into Policy Decisions
- ▼ Fosters Project Ownership of Policies and Procedures



COE Benefits

(Continued)

- ▼ Enhances Communication Between Projects, Service Providers, and Integrator Functional Groups
- ▼ Exchange of Lessons Learned
- ▼ Establishes Consistency of Operations
- ▼ Provides Reproducible Documentation Trail of Decisions



To Keep The COEs Operating, Projects/Service Providers Must:

- ▼ Formally Identify Qualified Representatives to Each COE:
 - Radiation Protection, Safety, Environmental, ...
- ▼ Ensure Training of Representative
- ▼ Empower Representative to Make Decisions for the Project



COE's Support ISMS

Experience Has Shown That The
COE Process Works